

### **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed March 23, 2004. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 21 - 22, 24 - 29 and 35 remain pending. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 21 - 22, 25 - 28 and 35, and have canceled claims 23 and 30 - 34 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants have canceled claims 23 and 30 - 34 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office Action indicates that the claims 21 - 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Foslien* in view of *Monson*. With respect to claims 23 and 30 - 34, Applicants have canceled these claims without waiver, disclaimer or prejudice and respectfully assert that the rejection as to these claims has been rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Turning first to the *Foslien* reference, that reference generally relates to an adjustable bezel assembly. In this regard, Applicants agree with the Examiner's contention that *Foslien* does not clearly disclose "a first elongate alignment groove in a top portion of the housing and a second elongate alignment groove in a bottom portion of the housing adapted to slidably engage with a corresponding first elongate reference

rail located adjacent an opening in the data storage system.” (Office Action at page 3).

As set forth in detail below, Applicants also respectfully assert that *Monson* does not teach or reasonably suggest this and other features that also are not taught or reasonably suggested in *Foslien*.

Turning now to claim 21, that claim recites:

21. A data storage system comprising:  
a data storage system housing having an opening, and first and second elongate reference rails located adjacent the opening;  
a media storage device for storing a plurality of data media, the media storage device comprising a media storage device housing configured to receive the plurality of data media, the housing having a top, a bottom and opposing ends, ***the media storage device housing having first and second elongate alignment grooves, each of which is adapted to slidably engage with a respective one of the first and second elongate reference rails*** such that the media storage device may be inserted into and removed from the data storage system housing by slidably engaging the elongate reference rails and the elongate alignment grooves and ***guiding the media storage device through the opening of the data storage system housing along a longitudinal axis of the media storage device housing, the opposing ends of the media storage device housing being located along the longitudinal axis, the data media being inserted into and removed from the media storage device housing along an axis transverse to the longitudinal axis;***  
a data exchange device for reading data from the data media;  
and  
a media handling system for transferring data media from the media storage device to the data exchange device.  
(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Foslien* and *Monson*, either individually or in combination, are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering obvious claim 21. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that neither *Foslien* nor *Monson* teaches or reasonably suggests at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 21. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 21 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 22, 24 – 29 and 35 are dependent claims that incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 21, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are

in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that also may serve as an independent basis for patentability.


**Cited Art Made of Record**

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.


### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
M. Paul Qualey, Jr.  
Registration No. 43,024

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on

5/6/04  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature